arXiv:1511.04627v1 [quant-ph] 14 Nov 2015

The connection between phase synchronization in simple nonlinear system and stationary state entanglement in its quantum counterpart

E. D. Vol*

B. Verkin Institute for Low Temperature Physics and Engineering of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine 47, Lenin Ave., Kharkov 61103, Ukraine.

(Dated: November 17, 2015)

We begin with the simple model of phase sychronization in open classical nonlinear system which is represented in the language of angular momentum variables. After that we propose the relevant quantum counterpart of this system. Using the appropriate Lindblad master equation for the density matrix of two qubit realization of such system we have revealed that stationary state of this composite system is pure and entangled with small dispersion of phase observable. We believe that such curious connection between entangled stationary states of quantum composite system and phase sychronization between its subsystems may be typical for rather wide class of similar nonlinear open systems as well.

PACS numbers: 05.40.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement of pure and mixed states is a notable feature of quantum mechanics which plays a key role in all modern informational and communicational applications of the theory, such as superdense coding, quantum cryptography, teleportation and so on [1]. In this connection the important question may arise: whether there is any counterpart of entanglement for classical systems and if yes, how it can manifest itself. This problem was studied by several authors (see for example [**?**]), but all of them focused attention only on closed Hamiltonian systems and tried to find connection between the possible entanglement of ground state of the quantum system in question and peculiarities arising in phase portret of its classical counterpart when external parameters are changing. The main goal of the present paper is to propose an example of a simple nonlinear open system with phase syncronization which in addition has relevant quantum counterpart such that stationary state of the system turns out to be pure, entangled and reveals small dispersion of phase observable. Based on this enlightening example one can anticipate the general attractive hypothesis about the possible connection existing between entanglement of stationary state in composite open quantum system and such well-known classical phenomenon as phase synchronization of its subsystems. The present paper as we hope may be considered as a small step on the way of confirmation of this attractive hypothesis. So let us examine the model of phase synchronization in nonlinear open system which can be conveniently formulated in the language of angular momentum that interacts with its environment. The advantage of this model is that it has the relevant quantum counterpart for which the above mentioned connection looks especially clear. So let us consider the angular momentum $\overrightarrow{L} = (l_x, l_y, l_z)$ and assume that evolution in time of its components is governed by the next system of equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dl_x}{dt} &= 2\left(l_y^2 + l_z^2\right) \\ \frac{dl_y}{dt} &= -2l_x l_y \\ \frac{dl_z}{dt} &= -2l_x l_z \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Note some obvious features of the nonlinear model governed by the system Eq.(1). First of all it is easy to see that Eq. (1) implies the relation :$\frac{dL^2}{dt} = 0$ (where $L^2 \equiv l_x^2 + l_y^2 + l_z^2$) , or in other words, the total angular moment of the system is conserved . On the other side one can assert that independently from initial conditions $l_x(0), l_y(0), l_z(0)$ the angular momentum under study tends to its final stationary state with $l_y(\infty) = l_z(\infty) = 0$ and $l_x(\infty) = \max = \sqrt{L^2(0)}$, where $L^2(0) = l_x^2(0) + l_y^2(0) + l_z^2(0)$. Let us prove this statement. To this end in view it is convenient to write out the system Eq.(1) in so called quasithermodynamic form, namely:

$$\frac{dl_i}{dt} = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{ikl}\frac{dH}{dl_k}A_l \tag{2}$$

where ε_{ikl} is completely antisymmetric tensor of the third rank, $A_l = \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_{lmn}\frac{dS}{dl_m}\frac{dL^2}{dl_n}$; and $H(l_x, l_y, l_z)$ and $S(l_x, l_y l_z)$ are two given functions of the system state. In the concrete case of the system Eq. (1) , $H = L^2$ and $S = l_x$.It is easy to verify directly that Eq. (2) implies two general relations, namely :1)$\frac{dH}{dt} = 0$, and 2)$\frac{dS}{dt} \geq 0$.Thus the functions H and S governing the evolution of the system play the same role as energy and entropy functions in standard classical thermodynamics. As a result we arrive to the conclusion that final state of the system Eq. (1) should correspond to the state with maximal entropy function that is with $l_x = \sqrt{L^2(0)}$.

*Electronic address: vol@ilt.kharkov.ua

Now we want to demonstrate that dynamical system Eq. (1) may be considered as the simplest model of phase synchronization. Remind that synchronization is a general phenomenon of rhythm adjustment of two open nonlinear oscillating systems that can occur at arbitrarily weak interaction between them [5]. Further we will interested in only the case of complete phase synchronization when the phase difference between two oscillating systems under study tends to zero with time. Formally such situation can be described as follows. Let us select the phases of two systems φ_1 and φ_2 and their amplitudes $r_1$and r_2 as dynamical variables and write down the complete system of equations in the following schematic form:$\frac{d\varphi_i}{dt} = f_i(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, r_1, r_2)$, and $\frac{dr_i}{dt} = g_i(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, r_1, r_2)$ where f_i and g_i are four appropriate nonlinear functions that can provide the phase synchronization effect. One may write out this system as a system of equations for two complex variables: $z_1 = r_1 e^{i\varphi_1}$ and $z_2 = r_2 e^{i\varphi_2}$. Now let us introduce three auxillary variables l_x, l_y, l_z connected with z_1 and z_2 by the next relations:

$$\begin{aligned} l_x &= \frac{z_1^* z_2 + z_1 z_2^*}{2}, \\ l_y &= \frac{i(z_1 z_2^* - z_1^* z_2)}{2}, \\ l_z &= \frac{|z_1|^2 - |z_2|^2}{2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Using these relations one can obtain the equivalent system of evolution equations for phase sychronization phenomenon in the language of variables l_x, l_y, l_z. Note that above mentioned transition from four variables $\{\varphi_i, r_i\}$ to three variables l_x, l_y, l_z is the explicit analogue of the similar transformation proposed by J. Schwinger in quantum theory. Note that in quantum mechanics such transformation allows one to express three components of angular momentum operator by means of four operators: a_1, a_1^+, a_2, a_2^+ , satisfying to standard Bose commutation relations. In view of obvious relations: $l_x = r_1 r_2 \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)$ and $l_y = r_1 r_2 \sin(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)$ one can express the condition of complete phase synchronization by two equivalent ways :1) $l_y(\infty) = 0$ or 2) $l_x(0) = \max$ .Thus the realization of complete phase sychronization in nonlinear model Eq. (1) has been proved. Let us present now the appropriate quantum counterpart of the proposed nonlinear classical model.The consistent way to "quantize" classical equations of motion for open system (at least in semiclassical approximation) was proposed by author in the paper [5], where some instructive examples were represented as well. In the case of Eq. (1) the relevant recipe of quantization can be formulated as follows (all necessary details the reader can find in [5]). First of all one needs to represent the classic equations of motion for variables l_x, l_y, l_z in the next specific form that allows their successive quantization, namely:

$$\frac{dl_\alpha}{dt} = -\left(\overrightarrow{l} \times \frac{\delta H}{\delta \overrightarrow{l}}\right)_\alpha + i\sum_k R_k(\overrightarrow{l} \times \frac{\delta R_k^*}{\delta \overrightarrow{l}})_\alpha + c.c.. \tag{4}$$

where $H(l_i)$ and $\{R_k(l_i)\}$ is some given set of functions of the state, and furthermore the function $H(l_i)$ is real while $R_k(l_i)$ are complex functions.It turns out that consistent quantum version of Eq. (4) can be obtained if one by means of known classical functions H and R_k reconstructs the relevant Lindblad master equation (LME) for density matrix $\widehat{\rho}$ of quantum counterpart of the system of interest. Thus the required Lindblad equation looks as :

$$\frac{d\widehat{\rho}}{dt} = -i\left[\widehat{H}, \widehat{\rho}\right] + \sum_k \left[\widehat{R}_k \widehat{\rho}, \widehat{R}_k^+\right] + h.c.. \tag{5}$$

where $\widehat{H}\left(\widehat{l}_i\right)$, $\widehat{R_k}\left(\widehat{l}_i\right)$, $\widehat{R_k^+}\left(\widehat{l}_i\right)$ are quantum observables that correspond to their classical analogues in Eq.(4). Speaking more simply one must replace classical variables l_x, l_y, l_z entering as arguments in functions H, R_k by corresponding quantum operators $\widehat{l}_i$ that satisfy standard commutation relations, namely: $\left[\widehat{l}_i, \widehat{l}_j\right] = i\varepsilon_{ijk}\widehat{l}_k$. If we return now to the concrete model of Eq. (1) it is easy to verify directly that the relevant Lindblad equation for the density matrix of its quantum counterpart may be represented in the next simple form:

$$\frac{d\widehat{\rho}}{dt} = \left[\widehat{R}\widehat{\rho}, \widehat{R^+}\right] + \left[\widehat{R}, \widehat{\rho}\widehat{R^+}\right]. \tag{6}$$

where the single jump operator $\widehat{R}$ has the form:$\widehat{R} = \widehat{l_z} - i\widehat{l_y}$

Let us now examine the LME, that is Eq. (6), which is characterized by single jump operator $\widehat{R} = \widehat{l_z} - i\widehat{l_y}$ in the simplest case of two qubit composite system for which the density operator $\widehat{\rho}$ is given by 4×4 matrix. In standard matrix reprezentation of angular momentum operator $\widehat{L}$ for the system with $l = \frac{3}{2}$ one can write down its components as :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{l_z} &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \widehat{l_x} &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{3} & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & \sqrt{3} \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \widehat{l_y} &= \frac{i}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{3} & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -\sqrt{3} \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Using the expressions Eq. (7) one can easilyobtain the required matrix representation of jump operator $\widehat{R}$ in the next form:

$$\widehat{R} = \widehat{l_z} - i\widehat{l_y} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 3 & -\sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{3} & 1 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 & -\sqrt{3} \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & -3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{8}$$

In the present paper we are interested in only the stationary solutions of the LME,with jump operator given by Eq. (8). In this case it is easy to see that all pure stationary states of the system can be found by the solution of the equation: $\widehat{R}\left|\Psi\right\rangle_{st}=0$. Omitting the trivial algebra let us present the required result for $\left|\Psi\right\rangle_{st}$ in the form :

$$\left|\Psi\right\rangle_{st}=\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix}1\\ \sqrt{3}\\ \sqrt{3}\\ 1\end{pmatrix}. \tag{9}$$

We reveal that stationary state of our model is entangled, because it cannot be represented in factorized form as : $\left|\Psi\right\rangle_{st}=\begin{pmatrix}a\\ b\end{pmatrix}\otimes\begin{pmatrix}c\\ d\end{pmatrix}$ where $\begin{pmatrix}a\\ b\end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix}c\\ d\end{pmatrix}$ are states of first and second qubits respectively. It is well known that in the case of two qubit pure state : $\left|\Psi\right\rangle=\begin{pmatrix}\Psi_1\\ \Psi_2\\ \Psi_3\\ \Psi_4\end{pmatrix}$ there is the simple measure for pure state entanglement , namely, the concurrence- C . According to definition: $C=2\left|\Psi_1\Psi_4-\Psi_2\Psi_4\right|$. It is easy to see that for the stationary state Eq. (9) concurrence is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. Now let us clarify another intriguing point : how the stationary state of the model Eq. (6) is connected with eigenstates of its quantum phase. Here it should be noted that the concept of quantum phase operator in the case of infinite dimensional Hlbert space rather complicated and is not clear enough.This problem was discussed in quite number of papers (see the most important contributions on this subject in the book [8]). However for finite -dimensional quantum systems the problem may be represented much simpler as follows: let us consider in N dimensional Hilbert space ($N=2l+1$, where l some integer or half-integer) ,
the raising operator $\widehat{l_+}$ with the next matrix elements in standard basis $\left|l,m\right\rangle$: $\left\langle l,m\right|\ l_+\left|l,m-1\right\rangle=\sqrt{(l-m+1)(l+m)}$. After that one can correctly define the polar decomposition of operator $\widehat{l_+}$ in the form: $\widehat{l_+}=\sqrt{\widehat{l_+}\widehat{l}}e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}$.Respectively, the lowering operator $\widehat{l}$ which is conjugate to operator $\widehat{l_+}$ looks as: $\widehat{l}=e^{i\widehat{\Phi}}\sqrt{\widehat{l_+}\widehat{l}}$. It is easy to verify directly that operators $e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}$ and $e^{i\widehat{\Phi}}$ in above decompositions are unitary and all their eigenvalues are the roots of N degree from unit. For example in the case of $N=4$, which is the main subject of our interest in present paper, above mentioned construction may be concretized as follows. The operator $\widehat{l_+}$ has the form: $\widehat{l_+}=\begin{pmatrix}0&\sqrt{3}&0&0\\ 0&0&2&0\\ 0&0&0&\sqrt{3}\\ 0&0&0&0\end{pmatrix}$ and corresponding phase operator looks as:

$$e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}=\begin{pmatrix}0&1&0&0\\ 0&0&1&0\\ 0&0&0&1\\ 1&0&0&0\end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

It is easy to see by direct calculation that the above polar decompositions are valid and furthermore $e^{i\widehat{\Phi}}.e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}=e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}.e^{i\widehat{\Phi}}=1$ that is operator $e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}$ is unitary in fact.The eigenvalues λ_i of operator $e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}$ are equal to : $\lambda_1=1$, $\lambda_2=-1$, $\lambda_3=i$, $\lambda_4=-i$, and corresponding eigenvectors may be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|1\right\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}1\\ 1\\ 1\\ 1\end{pmatrix};\quad \left|-1\right\rangle=\frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}1\\ -1\\ 1\\ -1\end{pmatrix};\\ \left|i\right\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}1\\ i\\ -1\\ -i\end{pmatrix};\quad \left|-i\right\rangle=\frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix}1\\ -i\\ -1\\ i\end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

It is easy to see that four vectors Eq. (11) form the complete basis in Hilbert space of two qubit systems.Note the obvious fact that all these states are not entangled. Now let us decompose the stationary state Eq. (9) of our quantum model Eq. (6) over the eigenstates of phase operator basis Eq. (11).The required decomposition may be represented as follows:

$$\left|\Psi\right\rangle_{st}=a\left|1\right\rangle+z\left|i\right\rangle+z^*\left|-i\right\rangle. \tag{12}$$

where a is real and z,z^* are two conjugate complex numbers.Comparing expressions Eq. (9) and Eq. (12) one can find that $a=\frac{1+\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{2}}$, and $z=\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}}\left(1-\sqrt{3}\right)(1+i)$.

Thus we arrive to the following conclusion: the entangled stationary state of the quantum model of phase synchronization Eq. (9) can be represented as superposition of three eigenstates of phase operator $e^{-i\widehat{\Phi}}$ with different phases. Note that the state $\left|-1\right\rangle$ which corresponds to the phase π is not included in decomposition Eq. (12). It is essential that maximum contribution in the decomposition Eq. (12) brings in the state with $\phi=0$. One may easily evaluate this contribution or its relative weight w as: $w=\frac{a^2}{a^2+2|z|^2}\approx 0,9$.

Summing up the results obtained in this paper we may conclude that entangled stationary state of the quantum counterpart of simple classical model of phase sychronization Eq. (1) is very closed to the unentangled eigenstate of phase operator with phase $\Phi=0$. Based on analysis of this model one may anticipate the attractive hypothesis that similar relationship may take place for a much larger class of nonlinear open systems which demonstrate the phenomenon of phase synchronization. In this connection it is worth noting that the possibility of similar connection on a qualitative level have been discussed at length in known correspondence between Wolfgang Pauli

and eminent psychologist K.G. Jung [8] many years ago. The exposition of this correspondence the reader can find in recent, rich in content, review paper [9]. The author hopes that the simple nonlinear model and its quantum counterpart proposed in the present paper can be considered as the small step on the way of quantitative simulation of this intriguing connection in more complex systems as well.

[1] M.A.Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000)

[2] A.P.Hines, R.H. McKenzie, G.J. Milburn, Phys.Rev. A71, 042303, (2005)

[3] C.Emary, N.Lambert, T.Brandes, Phys.Rev. A71, 062302 (2005)

[4] M.S. Santhanam, V.B. Sheorey, A.Lakshminarayan, Phys.Rev. E77, 026213,(2008)

[5] A.Pikovsky, M.Rosenblum, J.Kurths, Synchronization. An Universal Concept in Nonlinear Sciences, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002)

[6] E.D. Vol, Phys. Rev. A73, 062113, (2006)

[7] S.M. Bartlett and J.A. Vaccaro, Quantum Phase Operator: A Review,(Chapman and Hall, London, 2007)

[8] C.A. Meier (ed.), Atom and Archetype: The Pauli/Jung Letters, 1932-1958, Princeton University Press, Princeton, (2014)

[9] H.Atmanspacher, H. Primas, Journal of Consciousness Studies, vol 3, N2, 112, (1996)